existing by law that have been around for a long period of time should not be an earmark.

Another thing we need to do is separate the ability of people to have a cottage industry through lobbying for earmarks. That, frankly, makes everybody in Washington look bad. It erodes the public trust over a period of time.

There are times where someone advocating for you for a specific cause in this country is necessary, and that is called lobbying. Today lobbying has a bad name. If I was a lobbyist I would want these reforms so that my reputation is not tarnished. Just like we appropriators, WOLF, KINGSTON, WAMP, KIRK, CULBERSON, WELDON, GOODE and others that have helped us with this cause, we don't want our integrity tarnished by the people who abused this prerogative under the Constitution.

They are the ones, just like the local law enforcement guy who takes a bribe, all police officers are not like that, and all Members of Congress are not going to do what these people did. Thankfully, the people that have violated our trust are either under investigation or they are already gone or some of them are in jail. But the system needs to be cleaned up so that they cannot do that again. That is what hasn't happened. Frankly, there are some people in this institution who are kind of arrogant about this, saying that it ought to continue and that there is no reason for reform. But that is not true either.

So we have got to meet in a rational, logical way. That is why the select committee approach is the right approach. I am very, very proud to stand with Representatives WOLF and KINGSTON and others in support of this approach, and we will have a moratorium on earmarks until we make the needed changes to begin to restore the public trust and uphold the honor and the dignity that should be associated with our fulfilling our responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman. His comments are very good. I think it really needs to be bipartisan and it needs to be institutionalized, and it needs to be done in such a way that the American people have confidence.

I would yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), also a member of the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1730

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman for yielding and join this group of what we might call apostate appropriators who are leading the reform cause, because I think we all agree that the current system was broken under Republican leaders and broken under Democratic leaders.

I believe that we should not tax the American people more than necessary, that taxpayer monies should be spent wisely, and that Congress should use its power to cut waste to keep taxes low. Many congressional earmarks are a waste of the taxpayers' money.

I authored the amendment to kill the Bridge to Nowhere. It was a difficult choice, taking on a very powerful Member of Congress who had the ability, in some eyes, to delete all transportation funding for my own district. But I looked at this project, it was an earmark not by the Appropriations Committee but by the Transportation Committee, to build a $320 million structure slightly shorter than the Golden Gate Bridge, slightly taller than the Brooklyn Bridge, connecting Ketchikan, Alaska, population 8,000, with Gravina Island, population 50. Gravina Island has no paved roads, no restaurants, and no stores. It was clear that this was an extravagant expenditure of money by the United States taxpayers to benefit a very, very few number of Americans.

It was also disturbing about how this project was handled, as so many other low quality earmarks are done: air-dropped without consideration by the House or Senate floors; no potential to amend or kill this project by Senators or Members of Congress; added to a conference report, that is a final bill, at the last minute where everyone is only given one vote, ''yes'' or ''no,'' on the complete package and not able to reach in and delete funding for a low quality project.

Our battle, after the Kirk Amendment passed, was a long one, but finally the Governor of Alaska relented. And thanks to public outrage, thanks to congressional scrutiny, thanks to concerned Americans around this country, the Bridge to Nowhere will not be built.

But we have seen so many other projects which do not pass even a laugh test among American taxpayers. For example, a new earmark, I understand, for the Berkeley school system would create French gourmet menus for school lunches, clearly something that does not even pass the laugh test here on the House floor among Republicans or Democrats.

Also, we have seen these earmarks for Monuments to Me. I think it is perfectly appropriate when we see a proud public structure funded by the taxpayers to be named after one of our national heroes, to be named after a great American, or just great humanitarian from history, but not for sitting politicians who currently hold public office. I am worried that, for example, throughout West Virginia we have many Senator BYRD centers. It seems like almost a large part of the State is now named after a sitting Member of Congress, who comes with feet of clay, someone who can have great, great attributes and great detriments, and someone who really should be judged by history before we name great public works after them.

Our reforms talk about ending funding for these Monuments to Me. It calls for an increased level of, I think, appropriate humility in what we fund. In the past, like many of my colleagues, I have requested earmarks because I have been struck by critical needs in my district. But increasingly, in order to get funding for small projects in your district, you are asked to support funding for large projects in other people's districts, for Bridges to Nowhere, for more Monuments to Me, for things that are, quite frankly, not defensible for the public fisc and for the taxpayers' expenditure. I think we have to recognize that some of these earmarks will simply lead directly to higher taxes for the American people and for programs which do not reflect an appropriate decision by the government to remove funding from an individual taxpayer to provide for these projects.

That is why I back this moratorium that we have come forward with and I back the Kingston-Wolf reforms, because I think it is a recognition by members of the Appropriations Committee that the system is broken; that the public's confidence in how this money is spent is not there; that Republicans and Democrats should join together to fix it; that the power of the purse is rightly put by the Constitution in the Congress. But it has to be a power that is respected. It has to be a power in which judgment is leveled and which the burden of proof is against spending the taxpayers' funds so that always we have a feeling towards the bottom line of balancing the budget and making sure the tax burden on the American people is as low as possible.

That is why I thank the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Virginia for having this Special Order and hope that this legislation can pick up bipartisan steam and be adopted by the American people. They get it, but some of the elected representatives of the American people here still don't get it, and their voices need to be heard.

I yield back to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman. And in closing, unless the gentleman has any other comments, I would say this needs to be bipartisan. It is H. Con. Res. 263. I believe it will pass the House. I think it is inevitable that it will pass the House. We have to come together. I acknowledge there have been some sincere efforts made, and I think we come together and institutionalize this with regard to this select committee.

So I want to thank both Mr. WAMP and Mr. KIRK, and Mr. KINGSTON who could not be here, and the other Members who have put this together and say it needs to be done bipartisan. We have to do it so the American people can say, ''Well done. It really makes sense.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

## GEORGE WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the

gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, Congress officially moved the Federal holiday acknowledging our first President's birthday to the third Monday in February, so now it is commonly known as President's Day. I rise today to give more specificity to such an ambiguously titled designation and to try to pay appropriate tribute to that first President in our experiment of constitutional self-government.

George Washington was born February 22, 1732, almost 276 years ago. He died on December 14, 1799, at the age of 67, a mere 2 years after choosing not to run for a third term, thereby establishing a precedent now enshrined in our 22nd amendment.

He has been described as America's premier military and civilian leader during the Revolutionary era, and yet, as one historian has recently written, young people in particular do not know much about Washington.

By our time, in the early 21st century, George Washington seems so far removed from us as to be virtually incomprehensible. He seems to come from another place, another time, from another world.

He did not write a literary, political, military, or philosophical treatise that transformed our understanding of philosophy, physics, human affairs, or government. Nonetheless, throughout our history he has been compared to Cincinnatus, that late fifth century Roman figure who spurned his plow for a defense of Rome when so called by the Roman Senate. Why is this so?

The basic facts of Washington's life have been retold on innumerable occasions. Nevertheless, if only because this man is on our quarter, on the dollar bill, and on Mount Rushmore, they bear repeating.

Born in 1732 in Virginia along the Potomac River, he was a fourth-generation American. He was not the first-born son and his family was not in the top tier of the Virginia aristocracy. Probably standing at 6–2 to 6–3, and slightly above 200 pounds, he was a physically imposing man. He once threw a stone over the Natural Bridge in the Shenandoah Valley, which was 215 high, was generally regarded as the finest horseman in Virginia, the rider who led the pack of most fox hunts, and was a graceful dancer.

Washington was an adventurer and a surveyor in the Shenandoah Valley as well as an explorer of the Ohio country, then comprised of western Pennsylvania and parts of present-day Ohio. He became a Virginia militia officer, and was at Fort Necessity in 1754 for that ignominious surrender to the French. He left the Army 4 years later, married the wealthiest widow in Virginia, Martha Dandridge Custis, in 1759, and inherited the now magnificent Mount Vernon when his brother Lawrence died.

At this estate, he was an ambitious farmer, planter, and businessman, at first specializing in tobacco. During the course of time that he had Mount Vernon under his direction, he systemically quadrupled its size, eventually overseeing five farms and introducing new crop rotation schemes that are even today admired for their direction.

While he never seemed to have very much to say, he wasn't indifferent to the larger world. We are told he subscribed to ten papers at Mount Vernon, and in the 1760s, despite owning 50,000 acres, found himself 12,000 British pounds in debt. From this and other things, he came to believe the extant system of commercial trading with his British counterparts was designed for his and his neighbors' perpetual indebtedness. He became a nonimportation believer and a supporter of colonial efforts at self-sufficiency.

As we know, Washington served in the Virginia House of Burgesses. He spoke out against the Stamp Act of 1765, the Declaratory Act of 1766, and the Coercive or Intolerable Acts of 1774. During the First Continental Congress, Washington was a member of the Virginia delegation. After the clashes at Lexington and Concord, he attended the Second Continental Congress, wearing his old military uniform, and was nominated by John Adams on June 15, 1775, to command the volunteer forces that had amassed in Massachusetts because of the British occupation of Boston. On July 3, 1775, he took command of that Army, then called the Army of the United Colonies.

A couple of years ago, I was privileged to spend a semester at Harvard, and I remember walking through the streets just sort of looking at the people playing soccer and baseball, and I saw a monument that appeared to be not very spectacular. I went over to see what it was all about, and it was a monument to George Washington taking over that Army. Inscribed on the walls thereon are the words that he spoke that day to those troops. And while I do not have them from memory, I recall that he indicated to the men then assembled that they were to be united in this effort to fight for freedom. And as I stood there and looked at those words and tried to drink them in, you could almost sense the power of such a magnificent figure of George Washington talking to those assembled scattered troops from all over. He was, in a very simple sense, a commander who commanded the attention and the loyalty of his men. Of course, the Army of the United Colonies was the next year changed to the Continental Army, sounding quite a bit more professional than it was in reality.

While never known for groundbreaking military tactics or strategic innovations, Washington nevertheless displayed admirable courage; exemplified by his exploits in 1755 at Pittsburgh when, with British General Braddock injured, Washington had at least two horses shot out from under him, had bullets graze his uniform, only to be unhurt and commended for his bravery in leading the troops and organizing their retreat.

His subsequent leadership during the Revolutionary War was indispensable to the colonies' eventual success, finally achieved 8 long years later in the Treaty of Paris. He never accepted a salary as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army. More importantly, he was a visionary commander, finding such competent and important figures as the 33-year-old Rhode Island Quaker Nathanael Greene and the 25-year-old Boston bookseller Henry Knox.

While he fought a mere total of nine battles of which he only won three, Washington knew he had to keep the colonial forces intact in order to defeat the British and woo the French, a dual task he accomplished by not focusing on captured grounds, a war of posts as they say, but on maneuvering and survival. While highly critical of the untrained and undisciplined colonial forces, as Commander in Chief he wrote annual letters to the State governments and kept Congress knowledgeable of his situation in order to maintain some semblance of trust and harmony.

His surprise military and moral victories at Trenton and Princeton, as well as his steadfastness at Valley Forge the following winter, have gone down in American lore as true measures of commitment, of greatness, of endurance, and leadership. The suffering at Valley Forge was unimaginable. There, he wrote, ''To see Men without Cloathes to cover their nakedness, without Blankets to lay on, without Shoes, by which their Marches might be traced by the blood from their feet, and almost as often without Provisions as with; Marching through frost and Snow, and at Christmas taking up their Winter Quarters within a day's March of the enemy, without a House or a Hutt to cover them till they could be built and submitting to it without a murmur, is a mark of patience and obedience which in my opinion can scarcely be parallel'd.''

□ 1745

He helped to surround Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781, effectively ending the military aspect of the war. And after the Treaty of Paris was finalized, he resigned as Commander in Chief of the American forces and surrendered his sword to Congress on December 23, 1783.

Now, his decision to leave for retirement at Mount Vernon and attend the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 was not one without risk. As James Madison said, Washington would be making a decision to ''forsake the honorable retreat to which he had retired and risk the reputation he had so deservedly acquired.'' He did attend the convention and was elected President. As he later said: ''Whensoever I shall be convinced the good of my country requires my reputation to be

put at risk, regard for my own fame will not come in competition with an object of so much magnitude.''

At the Constitutional Convention, his presence was a calming and vital force. Probably ''the most graphic illustration of the singular status that Washington enjoyed was the decision of the Constitutional Convention to deposit the minutes of its secret deliberations with him for safekeeping.'' And as James Monroe later told Thomas Jefferson: ''Be assured, his influence carried this government.''

His universal admiration helped overcome the suspicions of the possibility of monarchy arising out of the new Constitution and its king-resembling, popularly elected executive office, a suspicion of which he was very much apprehensive. Republics were thought to be possible only in small, homogeneous enclaves, not on sprawling, vast continents. A fear of monarchy and the concomitant heavy-handed government rule, either from necessity or the nature of power-hungry man, was widespread.

As our Nation's first President, he instinctively knew he would be setting precedents for future executives to follow as they walked this tightrope between centralization and dispersion of power, between deference and democracy.

He was twice elected President unanimously by the Electoral College. As one of the premier historians of the founding era has written, ''The whole thing,'' that is the creation of the Constitution, ''was merely words on paper until implemented by Washington's government. Washington knew how malleable the situation was; he understood that every move he and his administration made would be a precedent that would shape the actuality of the Constitution, and he proceeded with great care. It was Washington, for example, who created the structure of the executive offices,'' we now call the Cabinet, ''and it was he who defined the Senate's role in foreign policy and something of the operational meaning of the words 'advise and consent.' ''

As Washington himself said: ''We are a young nation and have a character to establish. It behooves us, therefore, to set out right, for first impression will be lasting.''

As President, he believed in the rule of law, however unpopular such a belief might be at any given time. When the Whiskey Rebellion, a popular uprising in four counties in western Pennsylvania protesting an excise tax on whiskey, occurred, when it threatened to stop the normal functioning of civil government, Washington firmly stood against the subverting of civil authorities. More importantly, in relation to constitutional government, Washington was a firm adherent to its principles. He believed, in contrast to others of the age who sympathized with frequent revolutions ex nihilo, that decisions of a republican people ''only be unmade in the same way they had been made.''

This preference for ballots over bullets and appeal to republican, constitutional, ballot-driven self-government would be made again by Abraham Lincoln in 1861 and be equally as powerful. Self-government in the new Republic required adherence to the law, that is our Constitution, and the laws under it which articulate the boundaries and dimensions of our communal lives together as citizens.

As he said in his farewell address: ''This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and support. The very idea of the power and right of people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.''

So this combination of constitutionalism and consent, he believed, is the bedrock of self-government.

In 1775 Washington said: ''Make the best of mankind as they are, since we cannot have them as we wish.'' And as President, he ably navigated the waters between Anglo and French factions and their sympathizers, both overseas and within his own Cabinet.

It was Thomas Jefferson's opinion that Jay's Treaty of 1795, an important agreement which kept the United States out of the Franco-British imperial intrigues, that it passed because of the ''one man who outweighs them all in influence over the people,'' Washington.

Perhaps the words of the author Joseph Ellis sum up this magnificent life most eloquently when he says: ''Throughout the first half of the 1790s, the closest approximation to a self-evident truth in American politics was George Washington. A legend in his own time, Americans had been describing Washington as 'the Father of the Country' since 1776, which is to say, before there ever was a country. By the time he assumed the Presidency in 1789, no other candidate was even thinkable, the mythology surrounding Washington's reputation had grown like ivy over a statue, effectively covering the man with an aura of omnipotence, rendering the distinction between his human qualities and his heroic achievements impossible to delineate.''

In fact: ''Some of the most incredible stories also happened to be true. During General Edward Braddock's ill-fated expedition against the French outside Pittsburgh in 1755, a young Washington had joined with Daniel Boone to rally the survivors, despite having two horses shot out from under him and multiple bullet holes piercing his coat and creasing his pants. At Yorktown in 1781, he had insisted on standing atop a parapet for a full 15 minutes during an artillery attack, bullets and shrapnel flying all about him, defying aides who tried to pull him down before he had properly surveyed the field of action. When Washington spoke of destiny, people listened.''

Finally: ''His commanding presence had been the central feature in every major event of the revolutionary era: the linchpin of the Continental Army throughout 8 long years of desperate fighting from 1775 to 1783; the presiding officer at the Constitutional Convention in 1787; the first and only Chief Executive of the fledgling Federal Government since 1789. He was the palpable reality that clothed the revolutionary rhapsodies in flesh and blood, America's one and only indispensable character.''

Joseph Ellis's description speaks for itself in relation to the man that we honor this month. Still, it is not only for these facts alone that George Washington has earned our highest esteem. He is also frequently commended in discussions of republican political thought and classical virtue. One historian has recently written that ''Washington became a great man and was acclaimed as a classical hero because of the way he conducted himself during times of temptation. It was his moral character that set him off from other men.''

Washington's life was immersed in this classical milieu of republicanism, virtue, honor, and deference. Washington loved the classical play ''Cato'' by Joseph Addison in which virtue, not purely self-aggrandizement, is exemplified and praised. As a young man, he copied for himself a text called ''Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation,'' a list of over 100 short instructions on how to conduct oneself in the company of others, in society, and in the cultivation of one's manners and morals. While some may call these pithy exhortations trite or simplistic today, are we really going to ridicule Washington for being concerned with his ethical philosophy, a philosophy in which private and public morality are a seamless whole?

Washington did not have a classical education. He did not attend college. He was always insecure about these facts and tried to make ''up for this lack by intensive self-cultivation in liberal enlightened values.'' This self-cultivation was successful and it helped him lead others throughout his military and civilian endeavors. As one scholar has commented, adulation for Washington's classical virtues cannot simply be dismissed. He writes: ''General Greene, a Rhode Islander who became one of his most trusted deputies, told a friend that Washington's very presence spread 'the spirit of conquest throughout the whole army.' Greene hoped that 'we shall be taught to copy his example and to prefer the love of liberty in this time of public danger to all the soft pleasures of domestic life and support ourselves with manly fortitude amidst all the dangers and hardships that attend a state of war.' In

part, these rapturous assessments simply expressed the excitability of men putting their lives on the line for what seemed a hopeless cause. They needed to see greatness, and so they saw it. But the accounts are too specific and too consistent for that to be the only reason. Soon after Washington's appointment as Commander in Chief, that dour critic of men, John Adams, told his wife that the Virginian was destined to become 'one of the most important characters in the world.' Again and again, Washington struck the men of his day as an exemplar of ancient republican ideals, almost as though he had stepped from the pedestal of the ages.''

Another historian has written: ''Washington's writings are crowded with ringing affirmations of revolutionary ideals'' and ''Washington's friends and enemies alike testified that he deeply believed what he wrote. Like Cromwell's captain, Washington knew what he fought for, and loved what he knew. He was of one mind about that.''

Today, Washington speaks to us across the ages about virtue, education, and religious freedom. In his first inaugural address, Washington stated: ''There is no truth more thoroughly established than that there exists in the economy and course of nature an indissoluble union between virtue and happiness; between duty and advantage; between the genuine maxims of an honest and magnanimous policy and the solid rewards of public prosperity.'' And ''that we ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right, which Heaven itself has ordained.''

About the importance of seeing education and virtue as one philosophical whole, Washington wrote to his nephew George Steptoe Washington these words: ''Should you enter upon the course of studies here marked out, you must consider it as the finishing of your education, and, therefore, as the time is limited, that every hour misspent is lost forever, and that future years cannot compensate for lost days at this period of your life. This reflection must show the necessity of an unremitting application to your studies. To point out the importance of circumspection in your conduct, it may be proper to observe that a good moral character is the first essential in a man, and that the habits contracted at your age are generally indelible, and your conduct here may stamp your character through life. It is therefore highly important that you should endeavor not only to be learned but virtuous.''

In relation to religion, he was also convinced, as he declared in his farewell address, religion was an indispensable foundation for both morality and republican government.

□ 1800

As President, he attended the services of a variety of denominations. He addressed Jews as equal fellow citizens in his famous and articulate letter to the Newport Hebrew congregation in 1790. In it he said, ''the citizens of the United States of America, have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of a enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience, and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it were by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support. . . . May the children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants; while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid.''

This commitment to freedom of conscience had been previously heard in 1775 when Washington had written, ''while we are contending for our own Liberty, we should be very cautious of violating the Rights of Conscience in others, ever considering that God alone is the Judge of the Hearts of Men, and to him only in this Case, they are answerable.''

Finally, his Farewell Address, with its encouragement to avoid excessive partisanship, maintain American neutrality, achieve diplomatic independence, in short, to implement ''unity at home and independence abroad'' still strikes the chords of wisdom and prudence in our ears.

I salute the man in whose tribute a monument without words stands in our capital today. Its height, stature and distinctiveness speak for themselves. He was a unique man who seemed to be immune to both bullets and smallpox. It may or may not be true that Washington ''had neither copiousness of ideas nor fluency of words.''

Nevertheless, even a sometime harsh critic like Thomas Jefferson had to admit that ''the moderation and virtue of a single character . . . probably prevented this revolution from being closed, as most others have been, by a subversion of that liberty it was intended to establish.''

Now, Washington did say that ''with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be involved,'' and as we look to his birth, life, service, and death, we know that he was right, and that should give us pause.

Without Washington's character, his perseverance and achievements, all the important historiographical debates over the founding would be merely parlor games of philosophical intrigue. Unlike events in decades and centuries past, Washington believed in, literally started, and served in the system of government which would be called self-government. Feudalism; monarchy; primogeniture; artificial hereditary distinctions, sectarian bloodbaths. These were not to be the demarcations of this new Nation. As Washington, in his cautiously optimistic manner said in his 1783 Circular to the States, ''the foundation of our empire was not laid in the gloomy age of ignorance and superstition, but at an epoch when the rights of mankind were better understood and more clearly defined than at any former period.'' These rights were understood and defined on this newly freed and expanding continent, a land of which Washington said, ''is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. . . . It is well worth a fair and full experiment.''

For ''Washington, America was a practical experiment in the preservation of liberty and the success of republican government.'' As he said in his First Inaugural Address on April 30, 1789, ''The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted in the hands of the American people.''

In contrast to monarchies, Washington established the republican principle of rotation in office. ''Presidents, no matter how indispensable, were inherently disposable.''

George Washington was ''an extraordinary man who made it possible for ordinary men to rule.'' In the words of the great Frederick Douglass, the former slave and abolitionist, ''I would not, even in words,'' he said, ''do violence to the great events, and thrilling associations, that gloriously cluster around the birth of our national independence.'' ''No people ever entered upon pathways of nations, with higher and grander ideas of justice, liberty and humanity than ourselves.''

Madam Speaker, we have George Washington to thank for such beneficence. He made it happen. Now let us live up to that challenge to articulate and legislate the contours of liberty and justice for our collective humanity in these United States.

Happy birthday, President Washington. We honor you and appreciate your service to this, to our great country.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 2:45 p.m.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to: